

REMARKS

Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-21 were pending in the above-identified patent application.

Claims 5, 7, 8-11, 18, 20, and 21 are objected to for having informalities.

Claims 1, 2, 7-10, 12, 13, 15, 20, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gleeson et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,959,989 (hereinafter "Gleeson").

Claims 5, 6, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Gleeson in view of Nomura U.S. Patent No. 6,628,929 (hereinafter "Nomura").

Claims 11 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Gleeson in view of Sampath et al. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0174719 (hereinafter "Sampath").

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Gleeson in view of Tamaki et al. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0124976 (hereinafter "Tamaki").

Claims 3, 4, 16, and 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable subject matter has been indicated.

Summary of Applicants' Reply

Applicants note with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 3 and 16.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 8-13, 17, 18, and 20-23 in order to more particularly define the invention and to correct minor informalities and claim dependencies. Applicants have added new dependent claims 24 and 25. Applicants have also cancelled claims 3 and 16, without prejudice. No new matter has been added and the amendments and new claims are fully supported by the originally filed specification. Support for the amendments and new claims may be found, for example, in applicants' specification in paragraphs [0039] – [0051] and in FIGS. 5-6B.

Applicants' Reply to Claim Objections.

The Examiner objected to claims 5, 7, 8-11, 18, 20, and 21 for containing informalities. In particular, the Examiner requested that the term "flood packet" be replaced with "the flood packet with the attached header." Applicants have amended claims 5, 7, 8-11, 18, 20, and 21 in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, applicants request that the objection to claims 5, 7, 8-11, 18, 20, and 21 be withdrawn.

Applicants' Reply to the
Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1-21

In the interest of expediting the prosecution of the present application, and without conceding the issue of patentability, applicants have amended independent claims 1, 12, and 13 to include the features of dependent claims 3 and 16, which the Examiner indicated to be allowable. Therefore, independent claims 1, 12, and 13, as amended, are in condition for allowance. Furthermore, dependent claims 2, 4-11, 14, 15, and 17-21 are also in condition for allowance at least because they are dependent upon allowable independent claim 1 and 13, respectively.

Claims 22-25

Applicants' amended independent claims 22 and 23 recite methods for packet flooding in a wireless ad hoc network having a plurality of nodes. As recited in claim 22, a relay configuration is attached to a wireless flood packet as a header and the wireless ad hoc network is flooded such that each of the nodes in the wireless ad hoc network receive the wireless flood packet. As recited in claim 23, a relay configuration identifying one or more nodes is extracted from the header of a wireless flood packet and the wireless ad hoc network is flooded such that each of the nodes in the wireless ad hoc network receive the wireless flood packet.

Gleeson refers to a system for efficient multicast distribution in a wired local area network. Multicast distribution is a technique whereby information is delivered to a particular group of network destinations. During multicast distribution, network destinations identified by the multicast packet headers are known in advance, but the intermediate nodes used to transmit the packets are not identified. Thus, the network must determine the most efficient way to transmit the messages to the known destinations.

Gleeson's system for multicast distribution in a wired local area network does not show (1) flooding, (2) a relay configuration attached to wireless flood packet, or (3) a wireless ad hoc network, as recited by applicants' claims. In particular, applicants' claims recite that the wireless ad hoc network is flooded such that each of the nodes in the wireless ad hoc network receive the wireless flood packet. In contrast, Gleeson only refers to multicasting in which a packet is only send to a particular group of network destinations and not to each node in the network. Furthermore, the packet headers of Gleeson only identify the ultimate destination of the multicasting packet and do not identify any intermediate nodes. Thus, Gleeson also does not show a relay configuration attached to wireless flood packet as recited by applicants' claims. Finally, Gleeson only refers to a wired local area network and does not show a wireless ad hoc network as

recited by applicants' claims. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that Gleeson does not show all of the elements of applicants' amended independent claims 22 and 23.

For at least these reasons, applicants submit that the rejection of amended independent claims 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gleeson should be withdrawn. Applicants also submit that new claims 24 and 25 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable independent claims 22 and 23, respectively.

Conclusion

For at least the reasons set forth above, applicants respectfully submit that this application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael J. Chasan/

Michael J. Chasan
Reg. No. 54,026
Agent for Applicants
FISH & NEAVE IP GROUP
ROPES & GRAY LLP
Customer No. 28120
One International Place
Boston, Massachusetts 02110-2624
(617) 951-7000
(617) 951-7050 (Fax)